

TRUE FACTS

Written by

Al Caveman

August 14, 2017



Preface

This book’s primary objective is to educate you about difficult/non-obvious (but nonetheless important) facts about the universe that you live in. This book is written with the spirit that you, monkeys, are able to learn. This book is also highly anticipated:

“**Al-Caveman:** RobbieAB|work, would u read my book? **RobbieAB|work:** Depends how bored I am. **Al-Caveman:** ok. i take that as *yes*.”
— Freenode/#gentoo-chat-exile, 2015

“**Al-Caveman:** DistantStar, u? **DistantStar:** okay. **Al-Caveman:** perfect.” — Freenode/#gentoo-chat-exile, 2015

Note: I dislike DistantStar as of the 14th of July, 2017. I don’t know why I was even talking to this sucker. But it’s a mild feeling. He is not important enough to warrant any stronger feelings against him. However, I still like RobbieAB*.

Contents

1	History	3
1.1	The Past	3
1.2	The Present	4
1.3	The Future	4
2	Pending things..	5
3	Goodness	6
3.1	Definition	6
3.2	Why Should this Work?	7
3.3	How to Maximize Goodness?	7
3.4	Why All the Fuss?	7

Chapter 1

History

1.1 The Past

There are multiple possible reasons why you exist, but the one that is easiest to explain by monkeys like you (which is not necessarily the true one) is one that tries to minimize the role of miracles/magic. Turns out that your fellow monkeys found one that they think it minimizes that, and they decided to call it “*evolution*”, and it looks exactly like this:

Algorithm 1 The algorithm that made you.

```
for 1 ...  $t$  do
  trans( $\mathcal{U}$ )
end for
```

Where t is the total number of clock ticks, \mathcal{U} is the set of all elements of the universe, and trans is a function that randomly transforms elements in \mathcal{U} based on some distribution that I’ll touch later. For any $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{U}$, \mathbf{x} is a vector whose components describe exactly the perfect state of element x . You are \mathcal{M} (for monkey), where $\mathcal{M} \subset \mathcal{U}$.

The reason you exist is because Allah¹ decided to execute Algorithm 1 such that t is a large enough number, and the distribution that the function trans adheres to is a special one that permits your kind to exist.

No monkey (or group of monkeys) is known to fully know the distribution that trans tries to maintain, but some have figured out a few consistent rules

¹This material is not religion-oriented. Feel free to put your favorite God there including *none*.

that this distribution seems to stick to, which the monkeys decided to call “*Laws of Physics*”.

For example, imagine some particular state of the universe (i.e. a point in time where the vectors in \mathcal{U} have particular values) where there is an apple atop the surface of planet earth by a few meters. In this particular configuration, the function *trans* will modify the values of elements of \mathcal{U} as the clock advances such that the apple and earth will achieve a shorter euclidean distance between them until they hit each other. Once they hit each other, then other consistent patterns happen that the monkeys have figured out.

Hundreds of years ago, monkeys were thinking/conjecturing that this distribution is fully deterministic. I.e. the way *trans* will transform the elements in \mathcal{U} in the future (i.e. next clock tick) is fully dependant on the current values in \mathcal{U} at the present time (i.e. current clock tick).

Later on, some other monkeys (that stood on the shoulders of previous giant monkeys), suggested that there might be some intrinsic randomness inside the function *trans* that we can never fully know. At that time, some yet other monkeys didn’t like this idea and said things like “*God doesn’t play dice*”.

But before we answer whether the function *trans* has an intrinsic randomness that no one can predict (i.e. beyond the information in \mathcal{U} of a previous time), we need to know what is randomness? Do you know any algorithm that perfectly tells you if a number sequence is random for everyone (i.e. universally random and not relevant to the observer)?².

1.2 The Present

The specific configuration of elements in \mathcal{U} at some point in time between 1 and t as configured by Algorithm 1. I am pretty sure it’s not 1, and I feel (at the time of writing this) that it’s not t either. I can confirm now that it wasn’t t back then.

1.3 The Future

The specific configuration of elements in \mathcal{U} as configured by Algorithm 1 when the clock tick is a number that is greater than the number of the clock tick of some reference point that you consider the “*present*”. Many monkeys call this the “*future*”.

²A monkey named `_anomaly_` in Freenode’s `#gentoo-chat-exile` claimed “*yes*”, but then he retreated as he failed to find an algorithm that does that. He then claimed that he is not a mathematician. But somehow he dares to make claims about mathematics.

Chapter 2

Pending things..

- What should happen when t approaches infinity?
- What does it mean for something to be true?
- What does it mean for something to be good?

Chapter 3

Goodness

All feelings are objectively quantifiable. It's all materialistic. People who can't measure feelings, thoughts, manners, etc claim that these are not measurable, which they think is a more convenient response than having them admit that they are just pussies. I think even some famous dudes like Immanuel Kant¹ and Karl Marx² were pussies, too. I think that this is due to the fact that they [used to] drink poison³ which probably limits their brain's cognitive capacity. I, on the other hand, I think am poison-free, and I think I can do better. Watch.

3.1 Definition

So \mathcal{P} is the set of persons. $i \in \mathcal{P}$ is a person whom we wish to measure hos goodness. Also, for any persons $j, n \in \mathcal{P}$, say that $\text{value}(i, n, j)$ is a real number quantifying what person j thinks that person i lost, which profited person n . Then the goodness of person i in the eyes of person j is $\text{goodness}(i, j)$:

$$\text{goodness}(i, j) = \sum_{n \in \mathcal{P}} \left[\frac{\text{value}(i, n, j)}{\Pr(j \text{ agrees } i \text{ gave } \text{value}(i, n, j) \text{ to } n)} \right] \quad (3.1)$$

¹https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Immanuel_Kant

²https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Karl_Marx

³<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Alcohol>

3.2 Why Should this Work?

Dignity, and other positive things are only special cases of the “goodness” measure above. You only gain goodness in someone’s prospective when you benefit those whom they think benefiting is a good thing to do. If $\text{value}(i, n, j)$ is negative, then it means that i is taking value from n . If person j thought it was good to benefit n (as opposed to taking value from him), then person i will *lose* “goodness” points in j ’s eyes.

Also note that, this means that in total, i must be perceived to be losing value more than gaining. This is the only way the summation in (3.1) will be positive. In other words, (3.1) necessarily implies selflessness to be perceived.

People may call some actions that increase “goodness” dignity, kindness, generosity, cuteness, etc. But I don’t see a need for this sub-classification. I think it suffices to say “goodness”.

3.3 How to Maximize Goodness?

If budget is infinite, you just seek to maximize this quantity by making everyone maximally think that you are dignified:

$$\sum_{j \in \mathcal{P}} \mathbb{E}[\text{profit from } j | \text{goodness}(i, j)]$$

But, in practice, you are constrained by your budget (e.g. total money, time, etc), which limits the value of $\text{value}(i, n, j)$, as well as your capacity in persuading people that you are being selfless (i.e. maximizing probabilities above). Meaning, you need to intelligently distribute the budget to maximize that.

Note: if you are actually planning to do what this section says with the objective of maximizing your profit, then, by definition, you are also planning to become a liar (i.e. fooling people that you’re selfless, while actually seeking profits).

3.4 Why All the Fuss?

Why is this interesting? Now you may define subset $\mathcal{S} \subseteq \mathcal{P}$ as you think is interesting for your game-theoretic applications. Perhaps put persons inside \mathcal{S} that you think, game theoretically, have goals aligned with each other? Or even

use this the other way around to to cluster people by their game-theoretic needs to discover potential friends.

Last but not least: it helps you more optimally boost your “goodness” against a target community⁴. In other words, this can help you create optimal advertisements campaigns! Politicians may really love these principles.

If you realize, Elon Musk actually is maximizing his goodness by claiming that he may never profit back from Tesla, SpaceX, and other projects. He is actually doing a very good job here. This explains his popularity.

Another example is Alex Jones, but he does a worse job as his audience of idiots is smaller than those of Musk’s, and sells cheaper stuff like pineal-area wipes⁵. But Tesla loses more money too, so could it be that Alex Jones is actually doing a better job at the moment?

⁴Please, if you are a politician, or an advertiser, and need my help to engineer your target audience to love ya, please drop me a mail at toraboracaveman@gmail.com please, or ask for “caveman” in freenode’s #gentoo-chat-exile please, and persons there will tell you which among them is me. Money-back guarantee, VAT-exempt. Please don’t judge me by my cover, for ur own good. You really need me.

⁵<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=WYGq6cjcc3Q>